

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

TRANSLATION

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 100%; height: 100%;"></div>		Date of mailing (day/month/year)
Applicant's or agent's file reference W2213-000000		FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below
International application No. PCT/JP2005/001491	International filing date (day/month/year) 02.02.2005	Priority date (day/month/year) 04.02.2004
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC		
Applicant ASAHI KASEI LIFE & LIVING CORPORATION		

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. I | Basis of the opinion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. II | Priority |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. III | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. IV | Lack of unity of invention |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. V | Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VI | Certain documents cited |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VII | Certain defects in the international application |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VIII | Certain observations on the international application |

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP	Authorized officer
Facsimile No.	Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/001491

Box No. 1

Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/001491

Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement		
1. Statement			
Novelty (N)	Claims	1-7	YES
	Claims		NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES
	Claims	1-7	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-7	YES
	Claims		NO
2. Citations and explanations:			
<p>Document 1: JP 10-130434 A (Du Pont K.K.) 19 May 1998</p> <p>Document 2: JP 2002-188000 A (Asahi Chemical Industry Co., Ltd.) 05 July 2002</p> <p>Document 3: JP 2000-017157 A (Showa Denko K.K.) 18 January 2000</p> <p>Document 4: JP 2003-073538 A (Toyota Central Research and Development Laboratories) 12 March 2003</p> <p>Document 5: JP 2003-082212 A (Unitika Ltd.) 19 March 2003</p> <p>Document 6: JP 2003-261695 A (Unitika Ltd.) 19 September 2003</p>			
<p>The inventions of claims 1, 4 and 5 do not appear to involve an inventive step based on documents 1, 2 and 3-6 cited in the ISR. Documents 1 and 2 describe a thermoplastic resin composite material containing a master batch of a laminar silicate treated with a nonionic surfactant having a long-chain alkyl and polyoxyethylene unit, and the treated laminar silicate, and explain that a laminar silicate can be scattered. Here, as shown in documents 3-6, treatment using an organic onium salt is known as a treatment for scattering a laminar silicate; therefore, in the treatment of a laminar silicate in documents 1 and 2, combining a treatment of an organic onium salt could be easily conceived of by a party skilled in the art.</p> <p>The inventions of claims 2 and 3 do not appear to involve an inventive step based on documents 1, 2 and 4. Document 4 describes using an organic onium salt having a hydroxyl group.</p> <p>The invention of claim 6 does not appear to involve an inventive step based on documents 2 and 3-6 cited in the ISR. Documents 2-6 describe using an aliphatic polyester.</p> <p>The invention of claim 7 does not appear to involve an inventive step based on documents 1, 2 and 3-6 cited in the ISR. Forming a thermoplastic resin composition material into a stretched film is a mere matter that could be conceived of as appropriate by a party skilled in the art as shown in documents 3, 5 and 6.</p>			